DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 322 UD 019 119

AUTHOR	Gutmann, Babette; Paller, Alan T.
TITLE	State Profiles of Subcounty Allocation Procedures: Appendix to the Title I, ESEA, Subcounty Allocation Study.
INSTITUTION	Applied Urbanetics, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 77
CONTRACT	400-76-0158
NOTE	152p.; For related documents, see ED 128 500 and UD 019 120-123
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Mathematical Formulas; *Resource Allocations; *School District Spending; *State Federal Aid; *Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

In this appendix to the study of subcounty allocation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, state by state profiles of subcounty allocation are provided. The allocation formula and procedures used by each state for fiscal year 1977 are explained. Other data for each state, such as number of school districts and counties which participate in Title I, hold harmless and funds reallocations procedures, complaint handling, annual costs, and history of the program is included. The appendix was developed by Applied Urbanetics on the basis of information culled from Title I coordinators and their staff in each of the 46 states which perform subcounty allocation. (Author/WI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166322

Appendix
to the Title I, ESEA,
Subcounty Allocation Study

State Profiles of Subcounty Allocation Procedures

Babette Gutmann and Alan T. Paller

National Institute of Education
Contract 400-76-0158

March 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Applied Urbanetics, Inc.
1701 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006

UD019119

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the fifty State Title I coordinators who provided the information that enabled us to compile these profiles of state sub-county allocation procedures.

Project Staff

Applied Urbanetics, Inc.

Alan Paller
Lynette Ferrara
Babette Cutmann
Steve Smith
Dianne Seiffert
Dennis Linnell
Robert Corkhill
Barbara Baker
Susan Boyle
Pat Bowman
Rita Bamberger

Consultants

Seymour Sacks
Syracuse University
Eugene McLoone
University of Maryland

Government Monitors and Reviewers

James Harvey, NIE, Project Monitor
Charles Troob, NIE

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
STATE PROFILES	
Alabama	3
Alaska	5
Arizona	8
Arkansas	11
California	15
Colorado	18
Connecticut	22
Delaware	25
Georgia	27
Hawaii	30
Idaho	33
Illinois	36
Indiana	40
Iowa	43
Kansas	46
Kentucky	49
Louisiana	50
Maine	54
Massachusetts	57
Michigan	60
Minnesota	63
Mississippi	67

Table of Contents

page

STATE PROFILES

Missouri..... 70

Montana..... 73

Nebraska..... 77

New Hampshire..... 80

New Jersey..... 83

New Mexico..... 87

New York..... 90

North Carolina..... 93

North Dakota..... 96

Ohio..... 100

Oklahoma..... 104

Oregon..... 108

Pennsylvania..... 111

Rhode Island..... 115

South Carolina..... 118

South Dakota..... 121

Tennessee..... 125

Texas..... 128

Utah..... 131

Vermont..... 134

Virginia..... 137

Washington..... 139

Wisconsin..... 142

Wyoming..... 145

INTRODUCTION

This Appendix to the study of Subcounty Allocation of Title I, ESEA contains state-by-state profiles of subcounty allocation. The profiles explain the allocation formula and procedures used by each state in Fiscal Year 1977. Other data for each state include the number of school districts and counties that participate in Title I, hold harmless and funds reallocation procedures.

Applied Urbanetics, Inc., developed this Appendix on the basis of information provided by Title I coordinators and their staff in each of the 46 states that perform subcounty allocation. Some of the information was contributed by a group of Title I coordinators during an October 1976, Applied Urbanetics-sponsored, round table discussion on subcounty allocation practices, problems, and policy implications. Data for other states were gathered by Applied Urbanetics through telephone conversations with state Title I staffs. Subsequently, each state Title I office verified the information by reviewing and, in some cases, revising its profile.

These data are summarized in Volume I of the Subcounty Allocation Study: Current Subcounty Allocation Practices.

Background

Federal funds for compensatory education are appropriated under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended in the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380). The P.L. 93-380 Conference Report noted Congress' concern that the current Title I allocation system may lead to distributional effects that were not intended by the law. By Federal formula, allocations are determined by county. Subcounty allocation is the term given to the procedures used by states to apportion county allocations among school districts.

A separate section of P.L. 93-380 authorized the National Institute of Education (NIE) to conduct studies of compensatory education, including consideration of the feasibility, cost, and consequenses of alternative ways of distributing Federal compensatory education funds.

In September 1976, NIE contracted with Applied Urbanetics, Inc., to conduct an assessment of subcounty allocation. The resulting assessment, Title I, ESEA Subcounty Allocation Study is

presented in four volumes:

Volume I	Current Subcounty Allocation Practices;
Volume II	Analysis of Implications of Variation in Subcounty Allocation Formulas;
Volume III	Direct Allocation to School Districts by USOE: A Feasibility Study;
Volume IV	Executive Summary.

Volume I, Current Subcounty Allocation Practices, will describe the origin and extent of the subcounty allocation process, the formulas and data sources used by the states, the methods used to collect and process data, and the costs of those methods.

Volume II, Analysis of Implications of Variation in Subcounty Allocation Formulas, will describe the results of statistical analyses which identify the types of districts that gain or lose under various alternative formulas, as well as the extent of such gains and losses.

Volume III, Direct Allocation to School Districts by USOE: A Feasibility Study, will assess the capability of the U.S. Office of Education to determine district allocations in some or all states, will describe the benefits and drawbacks of direct allocation and will compare the level of effort of direct allocation with that of the current state and local process.

Finally, Volume IV, Executive Summary, will draw upon the preceding three volumes in order to define and evaluate policy issues such as who should perform subcounty allocation and how much flexibility should be allowed in selection, collection and weighting of data sources.

ALABAMA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
State Office Building, Room 460
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

II. Extent of Problem

Thirty-two of the 67 counties in Alabama are involved in subcounty allocation. None of the 67 districts have fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

LEAs within each county decide on the percentage of Title I funds each is to receive using their choice of available data. LEAs are supplied with ADA counts by the State Title I office, USOE Census figures by town and Free Lunch counts. Some counties use other information such as gas and power consumption. No AFDC data is used. Most counties use ADA to determine percentages.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

IV. Formula Used

Districts are allocated moneys for each child in an institution for the neglected and delinquent. The remaining moneys are divided among the districts in a county in proportion to the percentages that the LEAs have agreed upon.

V. Organization

Local Education Agencies meet and decide on percentage allocations of funds.

Title I office in State Department of Education allocates funds on the basis of Neglected and Delinquent and percentages supplied by LEAs.

VI. Hold Harmless

LEA-supplied percentages are used to allocate funds but State Title I Director assures that each district receives at least 85 percent of the previous year's allocation.

VII. Reallocation

One school district in the state does not accept Federal funds, and this frees about $10,000 a year. The money is redistributed within the county to the other LEAs in proportion to their initial allocations.

VIII. Complaint Handling

In two cases, LEAs have not been able to agree on allocation percentages. State Title I office reviewed the available information and arbitrated a decision. There have been no complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Meetings to agree on percent allocation

Local Education Agencies

Average of .5 professional person day per district (63 districts) @$75/day	$2,362.50

Annual Costs

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

6 professional person days @$75/day	$ 450

X. History

No major shifts in method since Title I began.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other poverty data sources are available by school district.

ALASKA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
326 Alaska Office Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801

II. Extent of Problem

Nineteen electoral districts (counties) are involved in the subelectoral district allocation process. Ten school districts are coterminous with electoral districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Federal poverty line by town as listed in "1970 Census Special Tabulation" supplied by USOE. Towns are aggregated where necessary to find counts by school district.

AFDC: January 1976, children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040 by electoral district supplied by USOE. Children are apportioned to school districts on State Title I Director's knowledge of population and demographic factors.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of children 5-17 living in foster homes by electoral district supplied by USOE. Children are apportioned to school districts on the basis of Title I Director's knowledge of population and demographic factors.

IV. Formula Used

Districts are allocated moneys for each child in an institution for the Neglected and Delinquent.

Remaining moneys are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of children in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040

+ Foster children 5-17

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education calculates Census data, apportions AFDC and Foster children to districts, receives Neglected and Delinquent information from USOE and combines all four factors to determine district allocation.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each school district in the electoral district which was above its floor. The number of school districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was nine.

VII. Reallocation

No moneys were available for reallocation in FY 76.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Districts have complained about inequities in the data, but no formal complaints about the allocation process have been made.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$120/day $240

Annual Costs

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$120/day	$600
5 clerical person days @$55/day	275
	$875

X. History

One district recently split into 21 smaller districts necessitating recalculation of Census data.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other poverty data sources are available by school district. There is no statewide Free Lunch program.

ARIZONA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

II. Extent of Problem

All 14 counties in Arizona are involved in subcounty allocation. In FY 76, Arizona had 248 active school districts and 81 had enrollments of fewer than 300.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: Children 5-17 living in families earning less than $3,000, aggregated to school district by Census Service facility, University of California at Berkeley. Special problems include poor primary Census collection on Native American reservations and relatively large migratory population. The printout from the University of California at Berkeley aggregates the 1970 Census low income count by County Civil Division in twelve counties and by Census tract in two counties. This data is then organized by school districts through the use of maps purchased from the Department of Interior.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Department of Economic Security supplies counts of Foster children 5-17 by age and school district obtained through manual address matching.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each district. Target children include:

Children 5-17 living in families with incomes less than $3,000

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17

Funds are divided between overlapping districts (high school and elementary) on the basis of average daily membership (ADM).

V. Organization

State Title I office is responsible for combining the data and calculating the district grants.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each school district in the county which was above its floor. The number of school districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 25.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to those districts that have suffered most from inadequacies in the representation of poverty. In FY 76, $650,000 was available for reallocation out of a total of $13.5 million.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No complaints have been received to date.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

Purchase of computer printout of low income eligible count by school district from the Census Service Facility, University of California	$ 200
Department of Interior Census tract and County Civil Division Maps	200
	$ 400

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Economic Security - Foster

The Foster Home Count is derived from a monthly computer printout used by the Department of Economic Security for their own needs.

State Education Agency

4 professional person days @$75/day	$ 300
4 clerical person days @$35/day	140
	$ 440

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

15 professional person days @$75/day	$1,125
15 clerical person days @$35/day	525
	$1,650

X. History

There have been no changes in method.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

The Department of Economic Planning and Development has developed a computer model, ADAM, which provides population estimates.

Free Lunch count information is available by school district.

ARKANSAS

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
Department of Education
Arch Ford Education Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

II. Extent of Problem

Seventy-four out of 75 counties in Arkansas are involved in subcounty allocation. One hundred out of 338 school districts in Arkansas have enrollments fewer than 300.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: Census-based information is not used.

AFDC: January 1975, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments, provided by Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, by school district. Because of technical problems, January 1975 data were used for both FY 76 and FY 77.

Local welfare caseworkers develop counts of children by school district.

Free Lunch: Free Lunch Division, Department of Education, provides counts of children, by school district, having an approved application to participate in the Free Lunch program. Data are collected by a special form included in the Free Lunch report that is sent out to the schools in October.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Children 5-17 living in foster homes by school district are provided by Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated for each Neglected, Delinquent or Foster child in a school district.

Remaining funds are allocated on the basis of target children in a school district. Target children include:

AFDC children 5-17

\+ children involved in Free Lunch program.

Each district receives a share of the funds (after the Neglected and Delinquent and Foster allocation has been subtracted) proportional to the number of target children in the district.

Some districts offer only elementary education and send high school aged students to other districts and pay tuition for them. Title I office receives copies of the tuition agreements and transfers allocation to receiving district based on the number of students sent and the percentage of target children in the sending district.

V. Organization

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services compiles AFDC counts by school district and Foster counts by school district.

Free Lunch Division, Department of Education and Division of Administrative Services are responsible for compiling information on children eligible for Free Lunch.

Title I office in Department of Education combines data from AFDC, Free Lunch and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

If a district falls below the 85 percent floor:

1. the district is funded at 85 percent;
2. the money allocated to that district is removed from the county allocation pool;
3. the eligible children in that district are subtracted from the county total of eligible children;
4. the remaining money is divided among the remaining districts according to their relative share of the remaining total county eligibles.

This process may have to be repeated because other districts may fall below 85 percent.

VII. Reallocation

The Title I program office distributes moneys available for reallocation according to need and demonstrated loss of funds from previous years. In FY 76, approximately $50,000 was available for reallocation out of a total of $23.8 million.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No complaints have been received from LEAs.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services - AFDC and Foster

Coding data to school districts

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375
State computer time for printout by district	$150
	$525

State Education Agency - Free Lunch and AFDC

7 professional person days @$75/day	$525

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

7 professional person days @$75/day	$525
5 clerical person days @$35/day	175
	$700

X. History

Prior to FY 76, moneys were allocated by assigning each district an amount equal to the county allocation divided by the OE-supplied count of eligibles, which was about $150, for each child in the district receiving welfare. The remaining moneys were allocated according to enrollment.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Pupil data, tax sources, land values, etc., for each district are available by county segment for each school district from county collectors, only.

CALIFORNIA

I. Responsible Agency

Compensatory Education Office
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

II. Extent of Problem

All 58 counties (consisting of 1,133 school districts) in the state are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: Census information is not used in subcounty allocation.

AFDC: AFDC information is the main source for subcounty allocation and has been since 1965. County Welfare offices provide information to the county superintendents of schools. The type of information received by the district may be addresses, names and addresses or addresses and ages, depending on the county welfare agency. School districts determine which children are in their attendance areas and the county superintendent forwards the information to the Title I office. All children 5-17 residing in families receiving welfare payments are counted.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Foster counts are not used in the subcounty allocation process.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated on the basis of AFDC children 5-17 and Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17 in each school district.

Elementary and high school districts overlap. When an overlap in jurisdiction occurs, allocations are proportioned on the basis of age of the children.

V. Organization

County superintendents of schools provide counts for LEAs within counties by locating all AFDC children by school district.

State Department of Education, Consolidated Application and Resource Management Unit, calculates grants manually.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor.

VII. Reallocation

A written release of the funds from the local Board of Education is obtained. Moneys are then allocated to districts on the basis of the following priorities: (1) districts that experienced a loss in funds because of application of the statutory formula, and (2) projects which demonstrate need for additional funds.

In FY 76, no moneys were available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

A formal complaint procedure has been established.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Local Education Agencies - AFDC

Average of 2 professional person days per district (1,000 districts) @$75/day	$150,000

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

10 professional person days @$75/day	$ 750
10 clerical person days @$35/day	350
	$1,100

X. History

This method was chosen in 1965 because it was felt that Census-based data could not be applied.

Title I office is developing a computer program to calculate allocations.

XI. Availability of Other Data

No other poverty data by school district is available.

COLORADO

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

II. Extent of Problem

Forty-seven of the 63 counties in Colorado are involved in subcounty allocation. Thirty percent of the 187 school districts in the state have enrollments fewer than 300.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: Children 5-17 in families below the Federal poverty line by school district as listed in "1970 Census Special Tabulation," supplied by USOE. Poverty children in districts with enrollments fewer than 300 were allocated to districts on the basis of district enrollment.

AFDC: Counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $5,040, by county, available from State Welfare Department.

Lists of children 5-17 in families receiving any AFDC payments are available from the county welfare agencies. Each school district matches enrollment lists with AFDC lists, determines a count of AFDC children 5-17, and sends the resulting count to the State Title I office.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of formula children in each school district. Formula children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ a "revised" count of AFDC children 5-17

+ Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of formula children in the county.

Revised AFDC counts reflect total numbers of AFDC children but are scaled down so that the sum of all "revised" AFDC children in a county is equal to two-thirds of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the current poverty line. The revision is accomplished by:

(a) subtracting Census and Neglected and Delinquent children from the OE-supplied county counts of formula children;

(b) dividing the results of (a) by the total number of AFDC children in a county; and

(c) multiplying the result of (b) by the total number of AFDC children in each district.

Steps (b) and (c) effectively distribute the OE-supplied AFDC counts on the basis of the current distribution, by school district, of total AFDC children.

When districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the number of children from each county. The State Title I office determines the number of children and dollars involved by gathering data from the school districts.

V. Organization

Local Education Agencies determine total numbers of AFDC children in each LEA.

Department of Social Services determines number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by county.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 25.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in which it will do the most to alleviate the effect of reduced allocations (e.g., to districts which lost funds). In FY 76, $20,000 (of a total allocation of $14.5 million) was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No reallocations are made in the event of complaints. Districts with data questions are referred to the National Center for Educational Statistics.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations for districts with enrollments of fewer than 300

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Local Education Agencies - AFDC

Average of 1.5 professional person days per districts (171 districts) @$75/day — $19,238

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

15 professional person days @$75/day	$ 1,125
15 clerical person days @$35/day	525
	$ 1,650

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Total AFDC children 5-17 by district is available from State Title I office.

Free Lunch counts.

CONNECTICUT

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

II. Extent of Problem

All eight counties are involved in subcounty allocation. Districts are coterminous with towns or cities, or they are regional high school districts. Legally, Connecticut does not have counties.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census data supplied by USOE contains counts of children 5-17 below the Orshansky poverty level by school district and county.

AFDC: State Title I office receives counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $5,040 by town. Department of Social Services has a computer program that prints counts of AFDC children by town by payment interval. AFDC administration is done at the state level since there are no county governmental organizations. The State Title I office then matches town to school districts to determine AFDC data by school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Department of Social Services provides counts of Foster children by town through manual address matching.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ all children in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

Department of Social Services compiles the AFDC and Foster data.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. Three districts were raised to their floor in FY 77.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed on the basis of need to districts which make written requests. In FY 76, $500,000 (of a total allocation of $16 million) was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

One LEA complained this year and the conflict was resolved by explaining the formula.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Social Services - AFDC and Foster

(AFDC) Computer resources	Not Available
(Foster) 3 professional person days @$75/day	$225

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375
5 clerical person days @$35/day	$175
	$550

X. History

In previous years, two-thirds of the AFDC children were used but in FY 77, the change was made to all AFDC to give more emphasis to the AFDC factor.

XI. Other Data Sources

For other data, contact the Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.

29

DELAWARE

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of
Public Instruction
John G. Townsend Building
Dover, Delaware 19901

II. Extent of Problem

All three counties (consisting of 26 school districts) in Delaware are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

AFDC: September 1971, children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above $2,000. Lists of addresses and corresponding school district codes of AFDC children are available from Health and Social Services Department. The count of AFDC children 5-17 in each school district was calculated by the State Title I office by tallying the numbers of addresses on the lists.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of children 5-17 received from the State Welfare Department, by school district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $2,000 (in 1971) plus Neglected and Delinquent children and Foster children in each school district.

V. Organization

Department of Health and Social Services determines number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above $2,000, by county. Each caseworker at the county welfare level determines the school district of the AFDC children according to the child's address.

VI. Hold Harmless

No district has fallen below the floor of 85 percent of the previous year's allocation.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation have never been redistributed. In FY 76, one school district initially refused its allocation but later requested the funds.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Information is supplied to LEAs on the procedures used and interpretations of the regulations are discussed in order to resolve complaints.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
1 clerical person day @$35/day	35
	$110

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts

Other data: contact the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation

AFDC data at other payment levels: contact the Department of Health and Social Services

GEORGIA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
State Office Building, Room 316
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

II. Extent of Problem

Twenty-six of the 159 counties in the state are involved in subcounty allocation, primarily between county-run districts and city-run districts. No districts have fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level, supplied by USOE by school district.

AFDC: Department of Human Resources provides names and addresses of all children aged 5-17 in families receiving any AFDC payments. Local school districts in a county meet and address match children to districts. Some of the districts (such as Atlanta and DeKalb county) receive the data on cards or on tape, and address match by computer. District totals are verified against the county totals by State Title I office. December data (available in January) have historically been used, but a change to October data is being made for FY 78.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are provided by the Federal government and are prorated within a county according to Census figures of Orshansky children.

IV. Formula Used

According to a State Board of Education policy, funds for FY 77 were allocated as follows:

(1) any suballocation of a county's grant for Neglected and Delinquent children aged 5-17, inclusive, residing

in approved local institutions or in Foster homes shall be the aggregate amount determined for such children in that county by the formula prescribed by P.L. 93-380.

(2) the remainder of such county's grant shall be sub-allocated among the affected local units of administration on the basis of the distribution of children aged 5-17, inclusive, from low income families as determined by a formula which places a weight of 75 percent on the most recent U.S. Census data and a weight of 25 percent on AFDC data. An LEA's grant shall be no less than 85 percent of the previous year's ratably reduced allocation.

There are three county regional high school districts involved, but the elementary and high school districts involved have not requested a transfer of funds to the high schools.

V. Organization

LEAs compile AFDC counts by school district from names and addresses provided by the Department of Human Resources.

State Title I office compiles information on Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children for calculations of grants.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in FY 76 was nine. If a district is in two counties, the allocation process ensures that the district receives at least 85 percent of the grant that the district received from each county the previous year.

VII. Reallocation

A review committee, consisting of the Director of Title I, two area consultants, the Director of Compensatory Education and a representative of the Division of Planning and Program Evaluation has been formed for reallocation. The committee reviews written applications for additional funds and makes recommendations to the State Superintendent of Schools.

No moneys were available for reallocation in FY 76.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Complaints from urban LEAs have caused a change in the allocation process to the current system. The previous system placed greater emphasis on AFDC data.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Local Education Agencies - AFDC

Average of ___ professional person days per district (_____ districts) @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day	$225
3 clerical person days @$35/day	105
AFDC printout	300
	$630

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375
5 clerical person days @$35/day	175
	$550

X. History

From 1966 through FY 74, Georgia allocated Title I funds solely on the basis of AFDC information. At USOE suggestion, State Title I office used Census information for FY 75 and FY 76.

Urban LEAs complained to State Board of Education and the current formula weighting Census 75 percent and AFDC 25 percent was mandated.

State is uncertain about what formula will be used in FY 78.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch count information is available from the Department of Food Services.

HAWAII

I. Responsible Agency

Compensatory Education Office
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

II. Extent of Problem

State of Hawaii has four counties, only one of which is involved in subcounty allocation (Honolulu). That county has four school districts. Legally, the state is one school district with all funding coming from the state.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families receiving less than $3,000 annual income by Census tract, supplied by U.S. Bureau of the Census. Where Census tracts are split by school district boundaries, poor children are apportioned according to school district ADA.

AFDC: Counts of children 5-17 in families receiving any AFDC payments compiled from Department of Social Services case files by consultant. Data taken from September and October files by manual address matching and payment checking.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children are not used for subcounty allocation.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated for each Neglected and Delinquent child to the school district with responsibility for N&D children. Remaining funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each of the four school districts.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in families with incomes less than $3,000

\+ two-thirds of children 5-17 in families receiving any AFDC payments.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

Consultant develops counts of AFDC children by school district from Department of Social Services files.

Compensatory Education Section develops counts of Census children by school district.

Compensatory Education Section combines information from Census and AFDC to determine allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

None of the four districts in Honolulu county have had to be held harmless at the 85 percent level.

VII. Reallocation

No moneys have been available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Some districts have expressed concern about the validity of the 1970 Census but have not objected to the allocation procedures.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Consultant - AFDC	$2,000

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$ 375

X. History

There have been no changes in the process since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch data are available.

IDAHO

I. Responsible Agency

Bureau of Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Office Building
650 West State Street
Boise, Idaho 83720

II. Extent of Problem

Twenty-nine of the 44 counties in Idaho are involved in sub-county allocation. Twenty-nine of the 115 school districts in the state have fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: Children 5-17 in families below the Federal poverty line by school district as listed in: "1970 Census Special Tabulation," supplied by USOE. Census counts of children are apportioned to school districts which are not on the OE listing according to average daily attendance of each district.

AFDC: Counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $5,040 as of January 1976, available by county from USOE. Counts are apportioned to districts based on State Title I Director's knowledge of economic and population factors, percent of low income children reported by the LEA, and discussions with LEA administrators.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are apportioned to districts based on Title I Director's knowledge of economic and population factors and discussions with LEA officials.

IV. Formula

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ two-thirds of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

All district allocations have increased steadily for the past several years, with the exception of Blaine County, which was held harmless by USOE.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts that have had a recent increase in student enrollment. In FY 76, the $12,000 (out of a total of $3.8 million) that was available for reallocation went to a district that had experienced a 12 percent per year increase in student enrollment.

VIII. Complaint Handling

The only recent complaint was handled by explaining the data sources and allocation procedure to the district.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations for districts with enrollments of fewer than 300

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Education Agency

1 clerical person day @$35/day	$ 35

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
1 clerical person day @$35/day	35
	$110

X. History

There have been no changes in the process since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

LEAs collect Free Lunch information for allocating funds within the district.

ILLINOIS

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

II. Extent of Problem

All 1,177 school districts are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 living in families below the Orshansky poverty level were identified from Census Bureau Fifth Count tapes. Counts compiled according to school districts by Department of Anthropology-Sociology and the Computer Center at Illinois State University.

AFDC: Children 5-17 residing in families receiving payments above $5,040 were compiled by school district using a card or "voucher" system. The head of each family receiving payments was mailed a card (coded as to payment level) for each child 5-17 in the family with instructions to have the child take the card to school and turn it in. These cards were annotated with special school district codes and sent by the school principals to the State Title I office. By sending a second mailing to families of children that had not handed in the first card, a total response rate of better than 97 percent was achieved. Data were gathered from an August AFDC mailing list and were multiplied by 1.01 to reflect the January 1976, total. These AFDC counts by school district will be used for the next two years.

N&D and Foster: All children under the legal guardianship of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (State wards) received a card similar to the one used for AFDC children and were instructed to hand in the card at the school that they attend. The Negligent and Delinquent and Foster counts by school district will be used for several years.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated according to the number of target children within each district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the current poverty line

+ State wards (Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children)

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's number of eligible children attending its attendance centers.

All sources of information are divided by ages so allocation can be made directly to elementary, secondary and/or unified districts.

V. Organization

Illinois State University, Department of Anthropology-Sociology, tabulated Census counts by school district.

State Welfare Department sent cards to families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level.

Department of Children and Family Services sent cards to Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children.

Title I office of the State Office of Education collects all cards and combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations, if applicable, are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each school district in the county which was above its floor. The number of school districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 150.

VII. Reallocation

No money has been available for reallocation. It is expected that some moneys will be available in FY 77. They will be distributed on the basis of need.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Twenty-two LEAs have currently filed a protest against their allocation of eligible children based on Census counts. A Census specialist at Illinois State University is checking their complaints with the aid of field studies by demographers.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency (prepared by Illinois State University)	$30,000

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Welfare Department - AFDC	
___ professional person days @$75/day	Not
___ clerical person days @$35/day	Available
Department of Children and Family Services - Foster	
___ professional person days @$75/day	Not
___ clerical person days @$35/day	Available
Local Education Agencies - AFDC and Foster	
___ professional person days @$75/day	Not
___ clerical person days @$35/day	Available
State Education Agency	
___ professional person days @$75/day	Not
___ clerical person days @$35/day	Available

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency	
30 professional person days @$75/day	$ 2,250
30 clerical person days @$35/day	1,050
Computer resources	Not Available

X. History

FY 77 is the first year of implementation of the total process described in this profile. In FY 76, Census Fifth Count data was available. In prior years, eligibles were suballocated within a county by County Superintendents on the basis of 1970 Census and AFDC information. The state effort to obtain counts directly was brought about by a change in state law tying state aid to Title I money received.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

A magnetic tape copy of the Census and AFDC information by school district is available from the Illinois Office of Education.

State Department of Public Aid keeps information on poverty areas but it is not organized by school districts.

INDIANA

I. Responsible Agency

Division of Compensatory Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Room 501, ISTA Center
150 West Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

II. Extent of Problem

All 92 counties (consisting of 304 school districts) are involved in subcounty allocation. In 1970, three districts had fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 living in families below the Orshansky poverty line supplied by USOE by school district. The three districts with fewer than 300 students were coterminous with townships and were included in published Census tables.

AFDC: January 1976. Two-thirds of the children 5-17 living in families receiving more than $5,040 in AFDC payments. Information is supplied by USOE and apportioned to school districts within a county on the basis of 1970 Census poor children per district. Per telephone conversation, a representative of the State Welfare Department has stated that the agency cannot provide information by school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are surveyed by the State Title I office on USOE-supplied forms. The completed forms are forwarded to USOE where they are validated. Eligible counts are returned to SEA from USOE.

Foster: Counts of Foster children provided by USOE are apportioned among school districts on the basis of Census poor children.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated on the basis of target children in each district. Target children include:

Children 5-17 living in families below the Orshansky poverty level

+ two-thirds of children 5-17 living in families receiving more than $5,040 in AFDC payments (apportioned according to Census poor)

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17 (Foster apportioned according to Census poor.)

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

The Division of Educational Information and Research collects data on the transfer of children from their district of residence to another district for service. This information is built into the allocation program and the "Formula" Child Count is automatically adjusted by the computer to reflect the transfer data.

V. Organization

Division of Compensatory Education of the State Department of Public Instruction forwards data supplied by USOE to a state computer program which calculates the grants.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 49.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are prorated to the five largest programs in the state in proportion to their formula count. In FY 76, approximately $112,000 was available for reallocation out of a total state grant of $21.5 million.

VIII. Complaint Handling

In the event of a formal complaint, a hearing procedure would be followed.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
Development of computer program	$1,155
	$1,230

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Education Agency

4 professional person days @$75/day	$ 300

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$ 425
11 clerical person days @$35/day	385
Computer resources	100
	$ 910

X. History

The computer program was written and implemented in FY 73.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other poverty data sources are available by school district.

IOWA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
Department of Public Instruction
Grimes Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

II. Extent of Problem

All 99 counties and 449 school districts are involved in the substate allocation process.

III. Data Used in FY 77

State Income Tax: (Used in place of 1970 Census.) Children living in families below the Orshansky poverty line identified from State Income tax reports. Taxpayers code school district (all districts are unified) on tax form. The State Department of Revenue sends the Title I office a printout, by school district, of farm and nonfarm families for various income levels and numbers of dependents. The process is repeated annually. FY 77 funds were allocated using 1975 tax information.

AFDC: April 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments, by school district, supplied by State Welfare Department. Caseworkers note school district on application form. Computer program prints out counts.

N&D: Neglected and Delinquent counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: State Welfare Department provides counts of foster children by school district. Caseworkers provide school district information for each foster child.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated on a statewide basis in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

Children living in families below the Orshansky poverty level as compiled through State Income Tax

+ all children 5-17 living in families receiving AFDC payments

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17

Each school district receives a share of the state allocation in proportion to that district's share of target children in the state.

V. Organization

State Department of Revenue provides counts, by district, of poverty children compiled from income tax reports.

State Welfare Department determines counts of AFDC and Foster children by school district.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Income Tax, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations. This is a manual process but a computer program is being developed to perform the calculations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the state which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 63.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts with priority given to districts that present plans to improve current programs. In FY 76, $130,000 out of a total allocation of $15 million was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No formal complaints have been made. Inquiries to data have been for information on how the allocations are made.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data Gathering

Welfare Department - AFDC

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
State Department of Revenue - State Income Tax (Paid for by Office of Programming and Planning out of the Governor's Office.)	$2,500

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
5 clerical person days @$35/day	$ 175
	$ 250

X. History

The system has been in effect without change for five years.

Income tax data is used because it provides more timely information than Census data. Development of the process took considerable effort but State Title I office feels quality of information justifies effort.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch information is available but not considered consistent.

KANSAS

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
120 E. 10th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612

II. Extent of Problem

All 104 counties in the state are involved in subcounty allocation. Forty-eight out of 331 districts in the state have fewer than 300 students. School district boundaries do not follow county lines. Some districts are located in several counties. Therefore, it is necessary to place children back into "home" counties before calculations begin.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty line, supplied by USOE, by school district and town. For districts with fewer than 300 students, the USOE listing by town is used to tabulate Census counts.

AFDC: State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services provides counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level, by school district. SRS computer prepares a list using central payments file, which contains demographic information, payment level and school district (coded by caseworker).

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services provides counts of Foster children by school district.

IV. Formula Used

Districts are allocated moneys for each child in an institution for the Neglected and Delinquent.

Remaining moneys are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Children are placed back into home county to determine per pupil county amounts, for school districts cross county lines.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of children in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county. A per pupil amount is determined for each county. That amount is multiplied by the number of formula (target) children in each district.

All districts are unified.

V. Organization

State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Research and Statistics compiles AFDC and Foster counts.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each school district in the county which was above its floor. The number of school districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 37.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in which it will do the most to alleviate the effect of reduced allocations. With approximately $500,000 out of a total allocation of $12 million, State Title I office is able to bring all districts up to the funding they had received the previous year and then to answer individual requests. Preference is given to maintaining existing programs rather than funding new projects.

VIII. Complaint Handling

The State Title I office receives several letters a year from LEAs, and problems are worked out individually.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services - AFDC and Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not Available
Computer resources	

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

13 professional person days @$75/day	$ 975
20 clerical person days @$35/day	700
	$1,675

X. History

Before the current Census reports were available (in 1972), funds were distributed within counties by enrollment.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

State Bureau of Education, Assistant Commissioner of Financial Services has financial information.

State Title I office has available AFDC counts from previous years.

KENTUCKY

I. Responsible Agency

Division of Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
W. Frankfort Office Complex
U.S. Highway 127, South
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

II. Extent of Problem

Sixty-one out of 120 counties are involved in subcounty allocation. Sixty-one of the 181 districts are independent school districts (a district that is part of a county but maintains a separate school system).

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level. Information supplied by two sources: (1) USOE by county and Minor Civil Division and (2) USOE special tabulation by school district. When the USOE information was considered accurate, the school district counts of Census poor were used. For the independent districts, the Minor Civil Divisions are coterminous with the city lines, which parallel the school district boundaries.

Using this information, district counts of Census poor were determined.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the poverty level of $5,040, available from the State Department of Human Resources. The Title I office submits maps of the physical boundaries of each school district to the Department of Human Resources. The county caseworkers, with the aid of the maps, code the school district of the AFDC children. The county welfare office forwards the AFDC counts by school district to the State Title I office.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are available from the Department of Human Resources, by county. Foster counts are prorated to school districts in the same proportions as Orshansky children are distributed in the county.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17 (Foster apportioned according to Census counts).

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county. The four districts that provide only elementary education are allocated funds by the method described above.

V. Organization

Department of Human Resources determines the number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by school districts, and number of Foster children by county.

State Title I office and Division of Finance for Federal Programs in State Department of Education determine Census counts for independent school districts and combine data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was Not Available.

VII. Reallocation

No moneys have been available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Information is supplied on the procedures and data used and the regulations in order to resolve complaints. The first year the 1970 Census was used, one county complained to the Census Bureau that the Census numbers were inaccurate and a recount was made.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Human Resources - AFDC

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day $375

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are available from the School Lunch Program.

For other data, contact the Division of Statistical Services.

LOUISIANA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

II. Extent of Problem

Only two parishes (counties), Washington and Quachita, are involved in subcounty allocation. Both have separate county and city school systems within their borders.

III. Data Used in FY 77

No current data are used. See formula below.

IV. Formula Used

The districts within a parish agreed upon the proportion of county Title I funds each would receive. The agreement was made in the late 60s, possibly on the basis of 1960 Census data, and has not been changed since.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education determines allocations for the two LEAs in each parish.

VI. Hold Harmless

Hold harmless is not applied.

VII. Reallocation

All the funds are applied for and used by the parishes.

VIII. Complaint Handling

One of the two parishes involved in subcounty allocation recently complained. The State Title I office is looking into alternative subcounty allocation procedures.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Meetings to agree on percent allocation

Local Education Agencies

Average of professional person days per district (4 districts) @$75/day	Not Available

Annual Costs

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

.5 professional person day @$75/day	$38

X. History

This process was implemented because the county and city districts overlap geographically and a child may choose which of the two districts to attend. This problem increases the difficulty in determining allocations on a statistical basis.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch data are available but were rejected as an allocation source because of the variability of the data.

Census data are available but the districts overlap geographically.

AFDC data are available but the districts overlap geographically.

MAINE

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Educational
and Cultural Services
Education Building
Augusta, Maine 04330

II. Extent of Problem

All 16 counties in the state are subdivided into a total of 123 school districts, which coincide with towns.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level by school district, supplied by USOE.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty line of $5,040 by town, available from the State Welfare office. Town data are aggregated to school districts by the Title I office. No town is served by more than one school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are supplied by the State Welfare office, by town. The State Title I office aggregates the counts to school districts.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $5,040

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county. Where school districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the district's proportion of target children from each county.

The 116 districts providing only elementary education are allocated funds by the method described above.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education gathers Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent, and Foster data, matches AFDC children to school district and determines district allocations.

State Welfare office determines the number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by town.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was not available.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other school districts within the county which send in written requests to the Title I office. Those districts most in financial need receive primary consideration. In FY 76, $13,700 (of a total allocation of $6 million) was available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No changes are made in allocations on the basis of complaints. Information is supplied on the regulations in order to resolve any complaints.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Welfare Office - AFDC and Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day ___ clerical person days @$35/day	Not Available

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day	$150

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts.

MASSACHUSETTS

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

II. Extent of Problem

All 14 counties (consisting of 366 school districts) in Massachusetts are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

AFDC: August 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving any AFDC payments, by community*, available from State Welfare Department. The State Title I office matches communities with school districts. The Post Office is used as a resource in this determination.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Foster children are not used because counts appear to be duplications of N&D children in many cases.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

AFDC children 5-17

+ Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17.

---

* A community is an independent town or a neighborhood inside a larger city. No single community lies in more than one school district.

In approximately 10 percent of the districts, a further reallocation process is required because of overlapping school districts. The formula applied for reallocation depends on the grades served by the school districts.

	Grades Served	Percent of Funds Received
1)	K-6	65
	7-12	35
2)	K-8	75
	9-12	25

V. Organization

Welfare Department determines number of AFDC children 5-17, by community.

State Title I office determines AFDC counts by school district, combines data from AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent to determine district allocations. The Fiscal Office assumes primary responsibility for the latter task.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 119.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in which it will do the most to alleviate the effect of reduced allocations (e.g., to districts which lost the greatest amount of funds). In FY 76, $374,000 (of a total allocation of $30 million) was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

In 1975, Census data was eliminated as a data source for subcounty allocation. At that time, some complaints were received in the Title I office from those districts which had reduced allocations. The Title I personnel responsible for grant calculation demonstrated that nearly all of those districts would have lost funds even if Census data had been included in the formula, thereby alleviating the complaints.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Welfare Department - AFDC

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375
5 clerical person days @$35/day	175
	$550

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day	$225
Computer resources	Not Available

X. History

1970 Census data were used in conjunction with AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent counts until 1975. The Census data were eliminated because of the belief that the data do not reflect the changes that occur in the poverty concentrations in many of the school districts from year to year.

The source of the Census data that were used was Bureau of the Census via Office of Education by town and school district.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts - available from the Bureau of Nutritional Statistics.

Unemployment data available by town from Division of Employment Security.

MICHIGAN

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48902

II. Extent of Problem

All 83 counties are involved in the subcounty allocation process. The 570 LEAs are organized into 59 Intermediate Districts, and Intermediate District superintendents are responsible for most of the data collection and complaint handling problems.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level by Minor Civil Division as listed in "1970 Census Special Tabulation" are supplied by USOE. Counts are retabulated from MCD to LEA by Intermediate School District superintendents.

AFDC: January 1976, addresses of families with children 5-17 receiving AFDC payments above $5,040 provided by State Welfare Department. Intermediate School District superintendents oversee LEA matching of addresses to local districts.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Intermediate districts apportion Foster children to school district in the same proportion as AFDC and Census figures.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of eligible children in each school. Eligible children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ two-thirds of children 5-17 in families receiving more than $5,040 in AFDC payments

- Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17
- Foster children 5-17 (apportioned by Census and AFDC)

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of eligible children in the county.

V. Organization

Intermediate districts apportion Census poor and Foster to LEAs under their supervision.

Intermediate districts supervise address matching of AFDC children by LEAs.

State Title I office in Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. Eight to 10 percent of the districts in the state were either held harmless within the county or were in a county which was held harmless at the 85 percent level by USOE.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed first to districts operating programs at the hold harmless level and second to other districts that have lost money.

In FY 75, $263,000 of a total allocation of $70.8 million was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

LEAs are requested to first attempt to resolve problems with Intermediate District superintendents.

The two or three problems in the last two years that could not be resolved at the intermediate level were put in writing and usually involved a site visit by the State Title I staff for resolution. Complaints were more numerous four or five years ago.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district - repeated annually (portrayed in Annual Costs)

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Intermediate school districts - AFDC and Foster

Average of 3 professional person days per district (59 intermediate districts) @$75/day	$13,275
Local Education Agencies - AFDC	
Average of 1 professional person day per district (570 districts) @$75/day	42,750
	$56,025

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

1 professional person year	$30,000

X. History

No changes have been made since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

State attempted to utilize income tax data but State Income Tax Department could not supply them with the information.

Title I office has organized a committee to look into other possibilities for substate allocation.

MINNESOTA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Capitol Square
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

II. Extent of Problem

All 87 counties in the state are subdivided into 439 eligible school districts. Forty-one of the school districts have fewer than 300 students.

Two school districts have assessed area in five counties. About 110 districts are in three or four counties. Only two districts are a single county entity.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level are available from USOE by school district and by Minor Civil Division. School district maps and Minor Civil Divisions were used by the State Title I office in conjunction with local knowledge of the school geography to determine Census counts for districts with fewer than 300 students.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,040, available from the Department of Public Welfare by school district and by school building. The county AFDC caseworkers code the school district of each child. The State Department of Public Welfare tallies the counts by school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are available from the Department of Public Welfare by school district in the same manner as AFDC counts described above.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of formula children in each school district. Formula children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the state allocation proportional to that district's share of formula children in the state. This determination is accomplished by:

(1) dividing the state allocation by the number of target children in the state to derive a per pupil amount; and

(2) multiplying (1), the per pupil amount, by the number of formula children in the district to determine the district allocation.

V. Organization

Department of Public Welfare determines the number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff and the number of Foster children, by school district.

Title I office in State Department of Education determines the counts of Census poor for districts with fewer than 300 students and combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's grant by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 70.

VII. Reallocation

All school districts are notified by the State Title I office that moneys are available for reallocation and are to be distributed on the basis of two criteria: (1) funds to extend the Title I program to run for a full year and (2) funds

to extend services to other eligible children not presently being served. LEAs are required to submit written requests. In FY 76, $700,000 of a total allocation of $24.6 million was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No changes in allocations are made on the basis of complaints unless a demonstrable computational error has been made. The Title I office and the two Title I Area Directors supply information on the procedures used in order to resolve complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

21 professional person days @$200/day (including fringe and indirect costs)	$ 4,200

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Public Welfare (including County Welfare Directors in 87 counties) - AFDC and Foster

120 professional person days @$75/day	$ 9,000
Computer resources	1,000
	$10,000

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$200/day	$ 1,000
5 clerical person days @$52/day	260
	$ 1,260

X. History

Since 1972, there has been no change in the data used. Prior to FY 75, however, counts of AFDC children were not available by school district from the Department of Public Welfare. Counts were obtained by county and 87 county meetings were then held each year with LEA representatives and the county Welfare Director to identify the number of AFDC children in each district, from the available records of names and addresses.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

"Fall Report Forms" are collected from each school building and may contain poverty data. (Contact the computer division of the State Department of Education.)

AFDC counts of children in families receiving payments of any level - available from the Department of Public Welfare.

MISSISSIPPI

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

II. Extent of Problem

Fifty-three of the 82 counties in the state are involved in subcounty allocation. The 53 counties are subdivided into 128 eligible school districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by USOE, by school district. In the three or four cases where new school districts have been established since the 1970 Census, maps displaying "beat lines," the Census breakdown of the county, are used to determine the Census counts for the school district.

AFDC: No families receive AFDC payments above the current poverty level.

N&D: Neglected and Delinquent counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts and addresses of children 5-17 in foster homes are available from the State Department of Public Welfare, by county. The Title I office identifies the school district of the Foster children.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

Where school districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the district's proportion of target children from each county.

Five agricultural high school districts receive funds under the same method applied to high school aged children.

V. Organization

Department of Public Welfare provides number of Foster children, by county.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 10.

VII. Reallocation

No moneys are available for reallocation since all eligible districts participate in the program.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Information is supplied on the procedures used in order to resolve complaints. When the Census data changed from 1960 to 1970 counts, the State Title I office discussed with each district their numbers of low income children. If a district experienced an unusual shift in poverty

concentrations, the Title I office was notified and, in two or three instances, adjustments were made in the poverty counts. No adjustments have been made in the past three years.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

21 professional person days @$75/day	$1,575

Annual Costs

Data Gathering

State Education Agency - Foster

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
2 clerical person days @$35/day	70
	$ 145

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts available from State Department of Education.

MISSOURI

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

II. Extent of Problem

All 114 counties and St. Louis City (115 total) and all 576 school districts are involved in the subcounty allocation process.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census information is not used for subcounty allocation.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 receiving AFDC payments by school district, supplied by Division of Social Services. School district information is coded by caseworkers on AFDC forms. A computer listing is made of children by school district and the listing is sent to the county welfare offices for verification and corrections for students who moved.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children by school district are included in the AFDC information provided by Division of Social Services.

IV. Formula Used

All districts in the county are first allocated funds on the basis of N&D children in the district.

The remaining money is allocated in proportion to the numbers of AFDC and Foster children in the district.

Some districts offer only K-8 education and send high school students to other districts. These districts pay tuition for high school students; Title I allocations are not affected.

V. Organization

Division of Social Services supplies counts of Foster children and children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from AFDC, Foster and Neglected and Delinquent to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. In FY 76, two counties were at the hold harmless level.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in which it will do the most to alleviate the effect of reduced allocations (e.g., to districts which lost funds). In FY 76, $6 million out of $29 million was available for reallocation.

Many Missouri districts were uncertain of their allocations until late in the school year and were unable to use their full allocations. This uncertainty was compounded by two other factors: (1) a large increase in funds available to the state and (2) an SEA-imposed limitation on programs which allowed funding for reading only. The resulting large reallocation is not expected to return.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Complaints arise in LEAs from a reduction in the counts of AFDC children in their area. They are advised to contact the Division of Social Services.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Division of Social Services - AFDC and Foster

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
Computer resources	Not Available

County Welfare Agencies - AFDC and Foster

.5 clerical person day per county (115 counties) @$35/day	$2,013

State Education Agency

1 clerical person day @$35/day	$ 35

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

.5 professional person day @$75/day	$ 38
20 clerical person days @$35/day	$ 700
Computer resources	Not Available

X. History

AFDC data has always been used because it is felt that Census data is outdated. A computer program was written to do the calculations for FY 76 and FY 77.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other poverty data sources are available by school district.

77

MONTANA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
Office of the Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Helena, Montana 59601

II. Extent of Problem

There are 56 counties in Montana; all counties are eligible for a county grant.

There are a total of 627 public school districts (October 1, 1975) in Montana. Three hundred forty-nine are eligible for Title I funds either by having at least 10 eligible children residing in the district or because of the Hold Harmless provision of the law.

III. Data Used in FY 77

AFDC: January 1976, computer printout lists of names and addresses of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments furnished by the State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Service are mailed to each county superintendent of schools. The county superintendent determines the school district residency of each child and returns the printout to the Title I office. These are confidential lists filed in the State Title I office for documentation and audit purposes.

General Assistance: The count and school district residency of Indian children 5-17 whose parents are receiving general assistance payments are prepared by the BIA and submitted to the Title I office.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Lists of names and addresses of Foster children 5-17 are furnished by SRS. The county superintendent determines district of residency. These lists are confidential and filed in the State Title I office for documentation and audit purposes.

IV. Formula Used

County grants are suballocated to public school districts in proportion to the number of eligible children residing in the districts. Eligible children include:

All AFDC children 5-17

+ General assistance counts of Indian children 5-17

+ Caseload data of children in local institutions for Neglected and Delinquent children

+ Foster home children.

Each school district receives a share of the county grant proportional to the district's share of the total eligible children residing in the county.

V. Organization

SRS furnishes computer printout data on all AFDC and Foster home children in Montana to the Title I office.

County superintendents of schools determine and identify school district residency of each AFDC and Foster home child on computer printout. Computer printout returned to the Title I office. Counts by districts are tabulated by the Title I office.

Title I office in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction combines data from AFDC, General Assistance, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

School districts which had an allocation the previous fiscal year, but which have fewer than 10 eligible children for the current fiscal year, are held harmless at 85 percent of the previous fiscal year's allocation.

School districts with more than 10 eligible children during the current fiscal year are allocated a ratably reduced amount of the remaining county grant, except if the allocation is less than 85 percent of the district's previous fiscal year's allocation, the district allocation is raised to the 85 percent figure.

Thus, the total county grant is reduced by the amount necessary to satisfy all "85 percent districts" and the remaining county

grant is shared proportionally to the number of children among all other eligible districts.

For 1975-1976, of the 349 Title I districts, 161 or 46 percent were held harmless at 85 percent; 26 or seven percent were raised to 85 percent and 162 or 47 percent were allocated either the full amount or a ratably reduced amount depending on the county in which districts are allocated.

VII. Reallocation

Funds available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in accordance with the Federal regulations (116a.11).

As of this date, there are available a total of $226,130 (of a total allocation of $4.8 million) for reallocation. Most of these funds come from districts which have allocations too small (less than $2,500) to operate an appropriate program by themselves or which cannot combine their allocation with neighboring districts to plan a program of $2,500 or more. Almost all of these funds have now been reallocated to needy districts.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No complaints have been received from LEAs in the Title I office.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

County Superintendents - AFDC and Foster

Average of 3 professional person days per county (56 counties)	$5,000

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency	$ 500

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972. Federal Census data are not used because such data are not available at the school district level.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

The Statistics and Research Bureau, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, is the contact for AFDC and Foster home data and furnishes the AFDC and Foster counts of children in families receiving payments above the poverty level to the Commissioner of Education.

The Data Processing Bureau of SRS furnishes the State Title I office with the computer printouts described elsewhere.

Free Lunch counts are avialable at the state level from the School Food Services in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. However, these counts are not used in the allocation formula because the data are not consistent. That is, not all districts have school lunch programs. However, we encourage school districts, if they so desire, to use district counts of free lunches for targeting purposes.

81

NEBRASKA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
Sixth Floor
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

II. Extent of Problem

All 93 counties in Nebraska are involved in subcounty allocation. Of the 1,374 school districts in the state, 1,074 have fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level are supplied at the county level from USOE. Poverty children apportioned to school districts within a county in proportion to district ADA for that year.

AFDC: April 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving any AFDC payments supplied by school district from County Welfare Office.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children are not used in the subcounty allocation process.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty (apportioned by ADA)

+ All children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments

+ Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17.

Some school districts only serve K-8 and 9-12 grade levels. That does not affect the allocation process because all information can be broken down by age level.

V. Organization

County Welfare offices determine the number of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. Very few districts are at the 85 percent floor.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in which it will do the most to alleviate the effect of reduced allocations (e.g., to districts which lost funds) and secondarily to districts that need additional funds to match salary increases. In FY 76, $250,000 was available out of a total state allocation of $8,435,000.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Less than a dozen complaints a year are received from LEAs and they are handled informally.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Welfare Department - AFDC

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not
___ clerical person days @$35/day	Available

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day	$150

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

8 professional person days @$75/day $600

X. History

The process has not changed since 1969.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Statistics Office, Department of Education, may be able to provide other sources of poverty data by school district.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
Division of Instruction
State Department of Education
64 North Main Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

II. Extent of Problem

All 10 counties in the state are subdivided into a total of 169 school districts. Forty percent of districts have fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level. Information supplied by USOE, at the town level. Town data are aggregated to school districts by the Title I office. One town is served by more than one school district.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level, by town, are supplied to the Title I office by the State Welfare Department. Title I office determines the school district in which each child lives and calculates a count for each school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are supplied by the State Welfare Department, by town. State Title I office aggregates to school district.

IV. Formula Used

County grants are suballocated on the basis of target children. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each district receives a share of county funds proportional to its share of target children.

Where secondary school districts encompass more than one elementary school district, the elementary districts are given the option of allocating part of their funds to the secondary district.

V. Organization

State Welfare Department provides lists of AFDC addresses and ages, and counts of Foster children.

Title I office in the State Department of Education matches Census, AFDC and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children to school district and calculates grants.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 67.

VII. Reallocation

Reallocation of unused funds is made, within counties, partially on the basis of the size of losses in allocation from the previous year. Other criteria for reallocation includes potential benefit of proposed programs.

Districts are required to submit a proposal for the use of the reallocated funds.

In FY 76, no funds were reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No changes are made in allocations on the basis of complaints. Information is supplied on the procedures used and the regulations in order to resolve the complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

1 clerical person day @$35/day	$ 35

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Welfare Department - AFDC and Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

6 clerical person days @$35/day	$210

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day	$150
7 clerical person days @$35/day	245
	$395

X. History

Prior to FY 74, total counts of AFDC children 5-17 were used rather than AFDC above poverty.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch data are available by school district from Division of Administration, New Hampshire Department of Education.

NEW JERSEY

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
255 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

II. Extent of Problem

All 21 counties in New Jersey are subdivided into a total of 611 school districts. Twelve of the school districts are eligible for Title I funds but are nonoperating districts. These Boards of Education send their children to other school districts and may participate in cooperative Title I programs with the receiving districts designated as the Administrative Fiscal Local Education Agency.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families included in the "Poor" column (the Orshansky poverty level). Information supplied by USOE, at the municipality level (Minor Civil Division). Municipality data aggregated by the Office of Administration and Finance, to school districts.

School districts with fewer than 10 poor children were not included in the Census data retabulations for determination of eligibility.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above current poverty level of $5,040. Lists of addresses and corresponding school district codes of AFDC children are sent to the State Welfare office from the county welfare offices. Counts of AFDC children 5-17, by school district, are calculated by the State Welfare office by tallying the numbers of children per address on the lists. Additional clerical support is provided from the Title I staff in the Bureau of Compensatory Education.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms, approved by SEA, and forwarded to USOE. SEA uses the count verified by USOE and included in the grant award.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

Further reallocation is necessary for the 50 to 60 regional high school districts in New Jersey. These districts each include several elementary school districts, have their own Boards of Education, and provide secondary education. The reallocation procedure is accomplished by:

(1) computing the number of target children in each elementary school district;

(2) computing the percentage of children from the elementary district who attend the regional high school;

(3) multiplying (1) and (2) together to determine the number of target children to be transferred to the regional high school count; and

(4) multiplying (3) by the per child amount for each county to determine the regional district allocation.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education gathers Census, AFDC, and Neglected and Delinquent counts of children 5-17.

Office of Administration and Finance in State Department of Education combines data to determine district allocations.

Division of Public Welfare determines the number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by school district.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. No more than 10 percent of the districts were raised to their floor in 1975-1976.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts on the basis of need (e.g., to districts which lost funds). Districts are required to submit a proposal for the use of the additional reallocated funds. In FY 76, $1 million (of a total allocation of $49 million) was available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No changes are made in allocations on the basis of complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day	$150

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Division of Public Welfare - AFDC

___ professional person days @$75/day ___ clerical person days @$35/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

12 clerical person days @$35/day	$420

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

8 professional person days @$75/day	$600
8 clerical person days @%35/day	280
	$880

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972. In 1972, the Title I office planned to use counts of all AFDC children 5-17, only, and distribute on a statewide basis, but USOE would not allow this change.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

AFDC counts at other payment levels - contact the Division of Public Welfare.

Other data sources - contact the Office of Management Information Systems.

NEW MEXICO

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

II. Extent of Problem

Eighty-six of the 88 districts in the state are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by USOE by county. For districts with enrollments in more than one county or children from other districts, counts are tabulated from the Census printout by Minor Civil Division.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts provided by State Foster Child Agency, by school district.

IV. Formula Used

A per-pupil allocation is used to determine total allocation to each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

State Foster Child Agency determines counts of Foster children in each district as reported to USOE.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of the previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. One district was held harmless in FY 76.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are redistributed to districts based on need and innovation. $19,000 out of a total state allocation of $12.4 million was available for reallocation in FY 76.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Complaints are handled informally. Only one district has complained about the accuracy of the Census information. Formal complaint procedures are being written in compliance with USOE regulations.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day $300

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Foster Child Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

4 professional person days @$75/day $300

X. History

There has been no change in the process since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

University of New Mexico, ISRD, has 1970 Census information by school district summary.

A yearly survey is made for selection of target areas.

NEW YORK

I. Responsible Agency

Division of Federal Education
Opportunity Programs
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

II. Extent of Problem

The 62 counties in the state are subdivided into 746 school districts. New York City, which is a single school district, encompasses five counties.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by USOE, by school district. For those districts which were not listed on the USOE printout including districts with enrollments less than 300, the school district's share of the total county low income count from the 1960 Census was used. This percentage was applied to the 197[illegible] Census count for the county to determine the district's share of Census poor.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,040. Lists of names and addresses or addresses only, by county, are supplied to the State Title I office by the State Department of Social Services. The AFDC printout is sent to each LEA and the Chief School Officer from each school district in the county is responsible for the identification of which addresses belong to each district. The lists are returned to the State Title I office where AFDC counts are tallied by district and multiple claims are resolved.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are received from the Department of Social Services, by community. The Title I office matches the counts to the school district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

When districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the number of children from each county.

V. Organization

Department of Social Services provides lists of names and addresses of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by county.

Local Education Agencies match addresses of AFDC children to each district.

Title I office combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was not available.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to districts which experience (1) a drastic cut in funds, (2) a high influx of low income children, or (3) an economic decline, such as high unemployment. Written requests are required from the districts for the use of the reallocated funds. In FY 76, $500,000 (of a total allocation of $180 million) was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Information is supplied on the procedures used and the regulations in order to resolve complaints.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Local Education Agencies - AFDC

Average of ___ professional person days per district (___ districts) @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

21 professional person days @$75/day	$1,575
52 clerical person days @$35/day	1,820
Printing, mailing costs (AFDC lists)	3,000
	$6,395

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

4 professional person days @$75/day	$ 300
24 clerical person days @$35/day	840
	$1,140

X. History

Prior to FY 76, the formula used was 1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty plus AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving any payments plus Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are available from the Bureau of School Lunch.

NORTH CAROLINA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of
Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

II. Extent of Problem

Thirty-one of the 100 counties in North Carolina are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: USOE counts of children 5-17 living in poverty (Orshansky) by county, supplied by State Title I office to LEA superintendent in counties where sub-allocation is necessary. Superintendents of school districts within a county reach an agreement on the apportionment of Census poverty children to school districts. They do this on the basis of any or all of the following: Free Lunch counts, Census count by school district, or local knowledge of poverty in the area.

AFDC: USOE-supplied counts of children 5-17 living in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040 by county are apportioned among districts on the basis of Census poverty children.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Board of Social Services provides counts of Foster children by city.

IV. Formula Used

Districts initially receive an allocation based on Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children. Remaining funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

> An agreement on the distribution of target children is reached by the superintendents of the school districts in a county, based on such data as Census and Free Lunch.

Each district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children.

V. Organization

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) determine the proportion of Census poverty children within their district.

Fiscal office, State Department of Public Instruction calculates district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which is above the floor. In FY 77, no districts needed to be raised to the hold harmless level. In FY 76, five districts were raised to that level, and in FY 75, 40 or 50 districts had to be held harmless.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys were available for reallocation only once, in 1966, when $200,000 was available. In that year, the Title I office received $6 million in requests and decided not to reallocate the money.

No LEA has released funds for reallocation since the "Tydings Amendment."

VIII. Complaint Handling

Districts with complaints are provided technical assistance and information regarding data sources.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Meetings to agree on percent allocation

Local Education Agencies

Average of ___ professional person days per district (___ districts) @$75/day	Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Board of Social Services - Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day ___ clerical person days @$35/day	Not Available

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

1.5 professional person days @$75/day	$112
.5 clerical person day @$35/day	18
	$130

X. History

The present process was initiated in 1966 by State Board of Education Regulation because the state felt that local educational agencies could better identify poverty children.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are available from Division of School Food Services.

NORTH DAKOTA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of
Public Instruction
State Capitol Building
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

II. Extent of Problem

The 53 counties in the state are subdivided into 351 school districts. Title I projects have been approved for 273 districts. There are 156 districts with Title I projects having enrollments of fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY '77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 living in families below the Orshansky poverty level, available from USOE by school district for districts with enrollments over 300. For districts with fewer than 300 students, Census counts were determined by assigning the remaining low income children to the school districts on the basis of enrollment. This determination was accomplished by:

(1) computing the percentage of the remaining low income children not assigned to those school districts with over 300 students, and

(2) applying the percentage derived in (1) to the enrollment of districts with fewer than 300 students to determine the Census counts of poverty children 5-17 in each of these districts.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,050, available from the Social Services Department, by county and school district. The State Title I office tallies the counts of AFDC children by school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 available from the Social Services Department, by county and corresponding school district code. The State Title I office tabulates the count of Foster children by school district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of formula children in each school district. Formula children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty line

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the state allocation proportional to that district's share of formula children.

V. Organization

Social Services Department determines the number of Foster children and AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by county. Welfare caseworkers code the Foster and AFDC children by school district.

Title I office in State Department of Public Instruction calculates counts of Census poor in districts with fewer than 300 students, tallies number of AFDC and Foster children by school district and combines Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster counts to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts are guaranteed 85 percent of the previous year's allocation. The guaranteed amount is compared to the current allocation and those districts which would receive more funds under the guaranteed amount are placed in a pool. The number of target children and dollars involved from the districts in the pool are subtracted from the state totals and a new per-child amount is calculated and multiplied by the number of target children in the districts not in the pool, to determine the final district allocation.

The number of districts raised to 85 percent of the previous year's allocation in 1975-1976 was 93.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts on the basis of priorities established by the State Title I office. The primary criteria are to distribute the funds to those districts which have substantiated that: (1) concentrations of low income children in their district are not represented in 1970 Census or AFDC counts, (2) the district does not receive sufficient funds to serve all target children and (3) the district has a need for additional moneys. Written requests by the districts are required. In FY 76, $80,000 (of a total allocation of $4.4 million) was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

A discussion of the regulations resolves any complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations for districts with enrollments fewer than 300

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$75

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Social Services Department - AFDC and Foster

2 professional person days @$75/day	$150

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day	$225

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are available by contacting the Food Services Program.

OHIO

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
933 High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

II. Extent of Problem

All 88 counties in the state are subdivided into 617 school districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by USOE, by political subdivision (Minor Civil Division). Counts by MCD were transposed onto maps showing school district boundaries. Representatives of each school district with knowledge of the district geography identified the portion of poverty children from the MCD in their district.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,040, available from the Department of Welfare by school district. The local caseworker codes the school district of each AFDC child. These counts are sent to the State Department of Welfare who forwards the counts to the State Title I office. Also available are AFDC lists by address so that district codes and counts can be verified by the Title I office.

N&D Neglected and Delinquent counts of children 5-17 are sent to State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 available from the Department of Welfare, coded by school district. State Title I office tallies the count by district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of formula children in each school district.

Formula children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of formula children in the county.

When districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the number of children from each county.

V. Organization

Department of Welfare determines number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff and Foster children, by school district.

Local Education Agencies determine number of poverty children from 1970 Census data by school district.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1976-77 was 30.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed according to the following procedure:

(1) survey the amounts of unused funds the LEA will release;

(2) the number of 1970 Census children plus AFDC children in families receiving payments above $5,040 is computed for each district to determine the number of eligibles;

(3) select districts with over 1,000 children;

(4) survey eligible LEAs to determine if they want to be considered for reallocation;

(5) the amount of funds available is divided by the number of formula children in the eligible districts to determine a per-pupil amount;

(6) if (2) is above the minimum cutoff of 1,000, and the district requests reallocation funds the amount is determined by multiplying the district number of eligibles (2) times the per-pupil amount (5).

In FY 76, $260,621 of the FY 75 funds was reallocated. In FY 75 the State allocation was $50,025,140.87.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Information not available.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

Local Education Agencies

Average of __professional person days per district (617 districts) @$__/day — Not Available

State Education Agency

Average of __ professional person days per county (88 counties) @$__/day — Not Available

Annual Costs

Data Gathering

Department of Welfare - AFDC and Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available
___ clerical person days @$35/day

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @75/day — Not Available
___ clerical person days @$35/day

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available
___ clerical person days @$35/day

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other poverty data sources are available by school district.

OKLAHOMA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

II. Extent of Problem

All 77 counties in the state are subdivided into a total of 618 eligible school districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by the Census Bureau in cooperation with Oklahoma State University, by county and Census tract. Counts by Census tract were transposed onto maps showing school district boundaries. Representatives of each school district with knowledge of the district geography identified the count of poverty children in their district. Additional data used in the deliberations included district enrollment figures and Free Lunch counts. Agreement was reached by each school district representative as to the count of Census poor children from the county total residing in each school district.

AFDC: March 1975, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,040 are supplied by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, by attendance area and client age. The State Title I office matches the attendance area to the school district. Where districts are composed of grades K-8 and 9-12, the age is included in the matching process.

N&D: Neglected and Delinquent counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 by school district are determined by a survey of foster homes performed by the State Title I office.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children in families above the poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

Where school districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the district's proportion of target children from each county.

V. Organization

State Social and Rehabilitation Services determines the number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by attendance area.

Local Education Agencies determine number of poverty children from 1970 Census data, by school district.

Title I office in State Department of Education matches AFDC counts to school districts and combines Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster counts to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocations by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-76 was 58.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts on the basis of priorities established by State Board of Education. Primary consideration is given to those districts which face financial hardship and are in need of additional funds to maintain continuity of services and to those districts which have experienced great shifts in the concentration of low income children since the 1970 Census. In FY 76, $19,500 of a total allocation of $19 million was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No reallocations are made in the event of complaints. State Board Guidelines have been established to formalize the complaint process. However, since each school district representative is required to agree in writing to the number of low income children in his district, no complaints have been received in the State Title I office in the past five years.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

Local Education Agencies

Average of 1 professional person day per district (618 districts) @$75/day	$46,350

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$ 375
4 clerical person days @$35/day	140
Average of 1 professional person day per county (77 counties) @$75/day	5,775
	$52,640

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services - AFDC

__ professional person days @$75/day	Not
__ clerical person days @$35/day	Available

111

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day $ 150

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day $ 225

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are available from the Director of Free Lunch Program.

OREGON

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Salem, Oregon 97310

II. Extent of Problem

Allocation of Title I funds is performed on a substate basis and involves all 36 counties and 334 districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level by Minor Civil Division are supplied by USOE. MCDs were aggregated to form school districts by Title I office.

AFDC: January 1976, names and addresses of children 5-17 living in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040 are supplied on cards by Department of Social Services. Cards are sent to county superintendents (mid-March) and LEA personnel meet and address match children to districts.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of children 5-17 living in Foster homes supplied at the county level by USOE and apportioned among school districts in proportion to the numbers of AFDC children.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated statewide in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above $5,040

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17 (Foster apportioned according to AFDC counts).

Each school district receives a share of the state allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the state.

V. Organization

Local Education Agencies determine counts of AFDC children in the LEA through address matching at countywide meetings.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC, and Neglected and Delinquent to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district which was above its floor. About 50 districts were funded at the 85 percent hold harmless level in FY 76.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to districts with these priorities: first, in-service programs (especially curriculum workshops); second, districts that have had a recent influx of Southeast Asian children; and third, other requests.

Reallocation moneys are limited to $2,000 per district. Approximately $154,000 was available for reallocation out of a total FY 76 allocation of $13 million.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Problems with LEAs have been resolved by explaining the allocation process. The use of workshops to explain the regulations has reduced the number of these problems.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

10 professional person days @$75/day	$ 750

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Local Education Agencies - AFDC

Average of .5 professional person days per district (200 districts*) @$75/day	$7,500

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

4 professional person days @$75/day	$ 300
3 clerical person days @$35/day	105
	$ 405

X. History

The process has remained unchanged for 10 years. Statewide allocation was initiated through a misunderstanding of the regulations but has been kept because of problems caused by districts crossing county boundaries and a desire to keep the allocation per eligible child uniform across the state.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other data sources are available on a statewide basis.

---

* Many very small districts are represented by the IED in this activity.

PENNSYLVANIA

I. Responsible Agency

Division of Compensatory Programs
Bureau of Special and Compensatory Programs
State Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

II. Extent of Problem

All 67 counties in the state are subdivided into 505 school districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by USOE, by municipality (Minor Civil Division). The State Tax Equalization Board is required by law to determine the market value of each school district in the state. To accomplish this, the Board first determines and certifies the market value of each municipality. The Title I office uses this data to determine the municipality composition of each school district and the Census counts by school district. Of the 2,584 municipalities, 44 are not located wholly in one school district. When districts cross municipality lines, the Census counts of poverty children are prorated on the basis of market value.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,040 available from the State Welfare Department. Information is received on tape and contains case number, name, address and birthdate for each AFDC recipient. In 1976, the State Welfare Department sent a card for each AFDC case to the County Board of Assistance. The caseworker identified the school district for each AFDC recipient and forwarded the coded cards to the State Title I office. The Title I office then established a computer file containing the case number, name, address, birthdate and school district code to be used as a reference file in subsequent years. Each year, the Title I office matches the new tape received from the Welfare Department against the original reference tape.

When case number and address do not match, the Welfare Department is notified, and they repeat the 1976 process of sending cards to the County Board of Assistance and having caseworkers identify the school district and return the coded cards to the Title I office.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are received from the Welfare Department, identified by school district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above the current poverty level

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

When districts cross county boundaries their allocations are adjusted to reflect the number of target children from each county.

V. Organization

Department of Welfare provides a tape containing the case number, name and address for AFDC children in families receiving payments above the current poverty cutoff. When a school district is not identifiable from previous tapes, caseworkers determine school district codes.

The Division of Statistics in State Department of Education matches Census counts to school district, tallies AFDC counts by school district, and combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-76 was 32.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to districts which experience a loss of funds and need additional moneys to maintain continuity of services and to districts which experience a shift in poverty concentrations. Written requests are required from the LEAs. In FY 76, $1 million (of a total allocation of $81.4 million) was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No reallocations are made in the event of complaints. Information is supplied on the procedures used and the regulations in order to resolve complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Welfare Department and County Board of Assistance - AFDC and Foster

134 professional person days @$75/day	$10,050
Computer resources	300
	$10,350

State Education Agency

50 professional person days @$75/day	$3,750
Computer resources	5,000
	$8,750

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

20 professional person days @$75/day	$1,500
20 clerical person days @$35/day	700
	$2,200

X. History

Prior to 1974, district allocations were made on a substate instead of a subcounty basis. The present method of subcounty allocation was adopted to comply with the regulations.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts - available from the Food and Nutrition Services.

AFDC counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $2,000 available from Department of Welfare. These data are collected for the state aid formula.

119

RHODE ISLAND

I. Responsible Agency

Federal Programs
State Department of Education
Roger Williams Building
Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

II. Extent of Problem

All five counties (consisting of 40 school districts) in the state are involved in the subcounty allocation process. Most districts are coterminous with towns or cities.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level tabulated by school districts from the Census Bureau listing by tract, supplied by the Department of Community Affairs.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $5,040 by city and town, supplied in April by Department of Social and Rehabilitation Service. Towns are aggregated, where necessary, to school districts.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of children 5-17 living in foster homes supplied for each town by Department of Social and Rehabilitation Service.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district.

Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving more than $5,040 in AFDC payments

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

Regional high schools are allocated funds from other districts in proportion to ADA.

V. Organization

Department of Community Affairs provides Census counts by district.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Service provides counts of AFDC and Foster children by town.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. One district was held harmless in FY 76.

VII. Complaint Handling

State Title I office has received no complaints from LEAs about subcounty allocation.

VIII. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency (prepared by Department of Community Affairs)

___ professional person days @$75/day
___ clerical person days @$35/day

Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Service - AFDC and Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available
___ clerical person days @$35/day

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$75/day — $150

X. History

Since 1973, there have been no changes in the process.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are not yet available by school district.

SOUTH CAROLINA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Rutledge Building Room 201
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

II. Extent of Problem

Seventeen of the 46 counties in the state are involved in subcounty allocation. None of the 93 districts has fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty line by school district as listed in "1970 Census Special Tabulation," supplied by USOE.

AFDC: AFDC is not used in the subcounty allocation process.

Foster: Department of Social Services provides counts of Foster children by county. These counts are prorated within a county relative to the Orshansky poverty index.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

IV. Formula Used

Moneys are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 special Census tabulation which conformed school district geography to Census data including 12 LEAs with overlapping jurisdiction of school districts

+ Number of Foster children 5-17 (apportioned according to Census count)

+ Number of children residing in institutions for the Neglected and/or Delinquent within local school districts.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

Department of Social Services provides counts of Foster children.

State Title I office in Department of Education combines data from Census, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each school district in the county which was above its floor. The number of school districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was nine.

VII. Reallocation

No funds have become available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Complaints from LEAs are handled by explaining the process used.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
1 clerical person day @$35/day	35
	$110

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day	$225
3 clerical person days @$35/day	105
	$330

X. History

When state received funds based on AFDC children, those children were apportioned by Census counts.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Food and School Services, Department of Education, can provide Free Lunch information and possibly other data. Fifty-nine percent of the students in South Carolina qualify for Free Lunch.

SOUTH DAKOTA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Capitol Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

II. Extent of Problem

All 67 counties in the state are subdivided, for a total of 196 school districts. Sixty-four percent of the school districts cross county boundaries and, in the extreme, one school district crosses into five counties.

There are 189 school districts in South Dakota that receive ESEA, Title I funds. Seven school districts do not operate, and contract their students to out-of-state schools.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level. Information supplied by USOE, at the county level (by Minor Civil Division). Also received from USOE, in 1973, a listing of the 1970 Census data by school district. The data by school district were not usable because South Dakota school district boundaries had undergone vast reorganization, and the boundaries in 1969 bore little resemblance to the boundaries in 1973. The Title I office, using the Census data by enumeration district and by county, reorganized that data by school district by the method described below.

The method used was similar to the method used by USOE. The task was accomplished in the following steps:

1. The enumeration districts in South Dakota are townships, towns and cities.

2. Each enumeration district was assigned to the proper school district.

3. Each township was composed of approximately 36 sections where each section equals one square mile.

4. The number of sections belonging to each school district was found.

5. The ratio of the number of sections in each township belonging to each school district was computed.

6. The ratio found in (5) was multiplied by the number of children 5-17 in each township to arrive at the number of Census poor 5-17 in each school district.

This process was performed in 1973. Any subsequent school district boundary changes are reported on an annual basis, and corresponding adjustments in the counts are made by repeating the above process.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 in families receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level of $5,040, by school district, available from State Welfare office. The AFDC caseworker in each county welfare office codes the school district by client address.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are available from State Welfare office, by school district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of AFDC children 5-17 in families receiving payments above $5,040

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county. Where school districts cross county boundaries, their allocations are adjusted to reflect the district's proportion of target children from each county.

A computer program was developed to perform the subcounty allocation process as described in the formula.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education determined counts of Census poor by school district and gathers Census, AFDC, and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster data.

Computer Processing Division in the State Department of Education developed and runs program to calculate district allocations.

State Welfare Department determines number of AFDC children in families receiving payments above the poverty cutoff, by school district.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 47.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other school districts on the basis of need as determined by the number of children from low income families. In FY 76, $45,255.32 of a total allocation of $5,677,625.00 was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No changes are made in allocations on the basis of complaints. Information is supplied on the procedures used in order to resolve complaints.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district	
State Education Agency	
90 professional person days @$60/day	$ 5,400
Development of computer program	
State Education Agency	5,000
	$10,400

Annual Costs

Data gathering

State Education Agency

2 professional person days @$60/day	$120
5 clerical person days @$35/day	175
	$295

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$60/day	$180
10 clerical person days @$35/day	350
Computer runs (per run)	300
	$830

X. History

Since there is no relationship between county and school district lines in South Dakota, grant allocations were made on a statewide basis in FY 75 and FY 76. The Title I office was told by USOE to change this process, and since FY 76, the allocations are determined within the county.

XI. Avilability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts - not all programs in all attendance areas.

AFDC counts at other payments levels available by contacting the State Welfare Department.

Other data sources - contact the Office of Statistical Services.

TENNESSEE

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
221 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

II. Extent of Problem

Thirty-five of the 95 counties in the state are involved in the subcounty allocation process. None of the 147 districts in the state has fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by USOE by Minor Civil Division. For the two counties which are not coterminous with MCDs, average daily attendance is used to apportion children to school districts.

AFDC: AFDC information is not used in the subcounty allocation process.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Department of Human Services supplies counts of Foster children by school district when possible. If Department of Human Services cannot supply information, Foster children are apportioned by ADA.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

Department of Human Services provides counts of Foster children by school district.

Title I office combines Census and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster information to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of the previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was three or four.

VII. Reallocation

In FY 76, $25,000 of a total allocation of $37.8 million was reallocated. Current Title I staff has not been involved in the reallocation process and will probably reallocate on the basis of recent loss in funds.

VIII. Complaint Handling

One or two complaints a year are received from LEAs, and most problems are solved by an explanation of the process.

If two superintendents and respective Boards of Education can agree that poor children have moved from one district to another, State Title I office reallocates money in accordance with their agreement.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Human Services - Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day Not Available

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375
5 clerical person days @$35/day	175
	$550

X. History

There have been no changes in this process since 1972. State is actively researching other allocation methods.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

State Planning Commission has demographic information.

TEXAS

I. Responsible Agency

Federal Funding Division
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

II. Extent of Problem

Out of 254 counties in Texas, there are 234 involved in subcounty allocation, and 20 are countywide school districts. There are 1,120 school districts in the state.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level supplied by Census tract by the Census Bureau and Minor Civil Division by USOE. Children were apportioned to school districts within a county at meetings of district superintendents using maps and Census tract information.

AFDC: AFDC information is not currently used in the subcounty allocation process.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children 5-17 are supplied by the Welfare Department, by school district.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county. Allocations are made with a computer program.

V. Organization

Local Education Agencies meet at the county level with State Title I staff and apportion Census children to school districts.

Those Census tracts, divisions, and places which were located totally within an LEA were assigned by a statistical review section at Texas Education Agency. Any tracts, divisions, or places which had more than one district located within these areas were distributed in county meetings. LEAs with taxable property in a county were invited to these meetings.

State Title I office combines data from Census and Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

Welfare Department supplies counts of Foster children by school district.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in FY 76 was 89.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts on the basis of need as determined on an individual basis. In FY 76, an undetermined amount was available for reallocation because districts can still claim FY 76 moneys.

FY 77 reallocation will be in accordance with established ESEA Title I Regulations. Reallocation will probably be based on needs identified by low income statistics utilized by the School Lunch Program.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Some districts have complained about the validity of Census data in rural areas.

In cases where the LEA representatives alleged inaccurate Census data, the staff referred them to the Bureau of the Census.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

Local Education Agencies

Average of ___ professional person days per district (1,116 districts) @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

Average of ___ professional person days per county (233 counties - there are 21 countywide districts) @$75/day	Not Available

Development of computer program

State Education Agency	$5,182

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Welfare Department - Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

39 clerical person days @$36/day	$1,404

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

Computer resources	$ 887

X. History

State used AFDC data through 1973 but no longer uses it because cutoff exceeds state payment level.

Computer program for grant calculations was developed in 1975.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other data sources are available. The School District Data Tapes and USOE listings by school district were judged inadequate.

UTAH

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Board of Education
250 East 5th South Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

II. Extent of Problem

Seven of the 29 counties in the state are involved in subcounty allocation. Eighteen of the 40 districts in the state are involved in subcounty allocation.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 living in families with incomes below the Orshansky poverty line supplied by USOE by town. Towns match school district boundaries fairly well, but when a district annexes property, Census data are recalculated by Census Bureau.

AFDC: January 1976, names and addresses of children 5-17 living in families receiving AFDC payments are provided on computer tape by State Welfare Department. Printout is sent to LEAs, and LEA officials match children to their respective districts.

Foster: Counts of Foster children by school district are provided by State Department of Child Services.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated on the basis of target children in each district. Target children include:

Children 5-17 living in families below the Orshansky poverty level

+ All children 5-17 living in families receiving AFDC payments

+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster Children 5-17

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

V. Organization

State Welfare Department provides computer tape of names and addresses of AFDC children.

Local Education Agencies determine total numbers of AFDC children in each LEA.

United States Bureau of the Census recalculates Census data when boundaries change.

State Department of Child Services provides counts of Foster children.

Title I office in State Board of Education combines data from Census, AFDC and Neglected and Delinquest and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-76 was one.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are reallocated on the basis of need. No money was available for reallocation in FY 76.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No formal complaints have been made but there is a formal complaint procedure. Informal inquiries are handled by explaining the allocation procedure.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

10 professional person days @$75/day	$750

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Local Education Agencies - AFDC

Average of 4 professional person days per district, (18 districts) @&75/day	$5,400

State Welfare Department - AFDC

1.5 professional person days @$75/day	$112
Computer tape preparation	29

State Department of Child Services - Foster

.5 professional person days @$75/day	$35

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day	$225
3 clerical person days @$35/day	105
Printing costs (AFDC list)	50
	$380

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

4 professional person days @$75/day	$300
2 clerical person days @$35/day	70
	$370

X. History

The process has not changed since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts.

State Office of Statistics might have some information.

VERMONT

I. Responsible Agency

Compensatory Education Office
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

II. Extent of Problem

All 16 counties in Vermont are involved in subcounty allocation. One hundred thirty-five of the 230 active school districts have enrollments of fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Orshansky poverty level, obtained from USOE by town. Data on towns were aggregated to school districts, with two exceptions. In one case, there was a town with a distinct school district within a larger one, but the small school district coincided with a Census town and the data were easily subtracted. In the other case, since there were no obvious ethnic or economic concentrations within the area, the eligible children were prorated on an enrollment basis.

AFDC: The Social Welfare Department provides the number of children in each town, aged 5-17, receiving AFDC payments above the current poverty level. Information by town is aggregated to school district. A computer program in the Social Welfare Department, when given dates of birth and payment level cutoff, will print counts of children, by town, within the age ranges, in families receiving payments above the specified limit.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Social and Rehabilitation Department provides counts and names and addresses of Foster children 5-17 by town. Prior to this year, it was a manual process but a computer program was developed that matches files for addresses.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

\+ All AFDC children 5-17 receiving payments above the poverty line

\+ Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children 5-17.

Sometimes, five or six towns will run individual elementary schools and combine to run a central Union High School district. In such cases, there is a supervisory Union Board with representatives from each school district involved. Allocations are made to the elementary schools, but if a high school presents a request for part of the allocation, the superintendent of schools may allocate the money to the high school.

V. Organization

Social Welfare Department provides numbers of AFDC children in families above poverty in each town.

Social and Rehabilitation Department determines counts of Foster children by town.

Title I office in State Department of Education aggregates town data to school districts and combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

Districts' allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in FY 77 was 57.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts in which it will do the most to alleviate the effect of reduced allocations. Since districts may carry over unused funds, money available for reallocation is extremely rare (about $3,000 - $4,000 out of a total allocation of $2.9 million).

VIII. Complaint Handling

Some districts have complained that the Census data does not accurately reflect poverty in their area.

In some cases, AFDC checks are mailed to post offices outside the recipient's town of residence because there is no post office in that town. When this is suspected, Department of Social Welfare inspects the welfare rolls for the actual town of residence. In only one case has this process resulted in a change in the size of the grant.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Social Welfare Department - AFDC

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
1 clerical person day @$35/day	35
Computer resources	13
	$123

Social and Rehabilitation Department - Foster

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75
1 clerical person day @$35/day	35
Computer resources	93
	$203

State Education Agency

1 professional person day @$75/day	$ 75

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

5 professional person days @$75/day	$375

X. History

There have been no changes since 1972.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Possible sources include the State Information System and the Department of Budget Management.

VIRGINIA

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Box Q
Richmond, Virginia 23216

II. Extent of Problem

Most counties are not involved in subcounty allocation. Virginia, because of its unique governmental system, is involved in subcounty allocation in only five counties.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 living in families below the Federal poverty line supplied by USOE by town and county.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated within a county in proportion to the number of Census poor children and Neglected and Delinquent children within each district.

V. Organization

Title I office in State Department of Education distributed funds to districts.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of the previous year's allocations by reducing the allocation of the other districts in the county. Two districts were raised to their floor in 1976.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts based on need. About $400,000 was available for reallocation in FY 76 out of a total state allocation of $37 million.

VIII. Complaint Handling

There have been no complaints to the State Title I office on subcounty allocation.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

.5 professional person day @$75/day $38

X. History

The process has not changed except for the addition of new districts on an intermittent basis.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

No other sources of poverty data by school district are available.

WASHINGTON

I. Responsible Agency

Federal Programs
Office of the Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

II. Extent of Problem

All 39 counties in Washington are involved in subcounty allocation. Sixty-five of the 303 school districts in the state serve children from more than one county. Ninety-eight of the school districts have fewer than 300 students.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 below the Orshansky poverty line are compiled by school district by a consultant. Poverty children are assigned to districts from the USOE listing by Minor Civil Division using county planning maps, voting records of school district votes by precinct and other local sources. Counts are updated yearly to reflect transfers of territory and changes in population and income as reported in state surveys.

AFDC: AFDC-based information is not currently used for subcounty allocation.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children are not used for subcounty allocation.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children in poverty

\+ Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

Districts that serve children from two or more counties receive allocations from each county they serve based on the above formula.

Most counties have districts that either send or receive students from other districts. The percentage of poverty children in a sending school district is multiplied by the number of students it sends to a receiving school district and the resulting number of poor children is credited to the receiving district's total target children and debited from the sending school's total target children.

V. Organization

Census consultant compiles Census information by school district using the University of Washington computer system.

Title I office in State Department of Education combines data from Census and Neglected and Delinquent to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was 61.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to other districts according to need assessed by State Title I field personnel. In FY 76, less than $20,000 out of a total allocation of $19.3 million was available for reallocation.

VIII. Complaint Handling

Most complaints are handled informally by explaining the process. Two districts have complained formally to USOE.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency (prepared by University of Washington)	$2,350

Annual Costs

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

6 professional person days @$75/day	$ 450
3 clerical person days @$35/day	105
	$ 555

X. History

Census information has always been the criteria for subcounty allocation. The 1970 Census data compiled by Census consultant became available for FY 73.

Title I office is attempting to obtain AFDC data from the Department of Social and Health Services by school district. If this information is obtained, it will be phased in over a 5-year period.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Census consultant has Census data by school district.

Free Lunch data is available.

WISCONSIN

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

II. Extent of Problem

All 72 counties in the state of Wisconsin are involved in subcounty allocation. Thirty-eight of the 417 districts in the state have enrollments of fewer than 300.

III. Data Used in FY 77

Census: 1970 Census counts of children 5-17 in families below the Federal poverty level by Minor Civil Division as listed in "1970 Census Special Tabulation," supplied by USOE. When a MCD lies in several districts, the poverty children in the MCD are apportioned to the districts on the basis of assessed value of the districts. This process is also followed whenever districts are reorganized.

AFDC: January 1976, counts of children 5-17 living in families receiving more than $5,040 in AFDC payments supplied by school district by Department of Social Services. Department of Social Services takes copies of county payrolls, selects names and addresses of children in families above the poverty cutoff, and sends these worksheets to county welfare offices. Counties indicate which children are 5-17 and the school districts of these children. The data, returned from the county welfare office, are forwarded to the Title I office in the State Department of Public Instruction.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts of Foster children by county supplied by USOE are apportioned among school districts according to county of AFDC and Census poor children.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include:

1970 Census children 5-17 in poverty

+ two-thirds of the children in families receiving more than $5,040 in AFDC payments

+ Foster children (prorated by above two factors)

+ Neglected and Delinquent children 5-17.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the county.

When a Union High School District (9-12) overlaps with an elementary district (K-8), funds are allocated on a proportion 9/13 to the elementary district and 4/13 to the high school district.

V. Organization

Department of Social Services provides counts of AFDC children by school district.

Title I office in State Department of Public Instruction combines data from Census, AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of the previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in FY 76 was 12.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to school districts based on these priorities: first, districts which have had a reduction in funds; second, districts which need money to maintain programs at current level; and third, districts which provide services to nonpublic schools. In FY 76, $600,000 out of a total state allocation of $25.9 million was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No complaints have been received other than misunderstandings of the allocation procedure.

IX. Costs

One Time Costs

Census tabulations by school district

State Education Agency

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Department of Social Services - AFDC

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available
___ clerical person days @$35/day

County Welfare Office - AFDC

___ professional person days @$75/day — Not Available
___ clerical person days @$35/day

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

20 professional person days @$55/day — $1,100

X. History

Title I office is considering developing a computer program to make allocations.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch information is available from Title I office.

Total AFDC children by school district is available for past years.

Department of Administration might have income tax information.

WYOMING

I. Responsible Agency

Title I Office
State Department of Education
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

II. Extent of Problem

All 23 counties in the state are subdivided into 51 school districts.

III. Data Used in FY 77

AFDC: February 1976, counts of all children in families receiving any level of AFDC payments, available from the Welfare Department by town and address. The State Title I office, with knowledge of the school district geography determines the number of AFDC children by school district.

N&D: N&D counts of children 5-17 are sent to the State Title I office by institutions on USOE-supplied forms.

Foster: Counts and addresses of Foster children available from the Welfare Department, and matched to school district by Title I office.

IV. Formula Used

Funds are allocated in proportion to the number of target children in each school district. Target children include AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children and are derived by:

(1) adding together counts of AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster children for each school district and determining the district share of the total county AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster count, and

(2) multiplying (1) the district percentage, times the number of 1970 Census low income children in the county to determine the number of target children in each school district.

Each school district receives a share of the county allocation proportional to that district's share of target children in the

county. This determination is accomplished by:

(1) dividing the county allocation by the number of eligible children in the county as identified on the printout received from USOE, to derive a per-pupil amount, and

(2) multiplying (1) the per-pupil amount, by the number of target children in each district to determine the district allocation.

V. Organization

Welfare Department determines the number of AFDC children by town and provides addresses of Foster children.

State Title I office determines number of AFDC children by school district and combines data from AFDC, Neglected and Delinquent and Foster to determine district allocations.

VI. Hold Harmless

District allocations are increased to the floor of 85 percent of previous year's allocation by ratably reducing the allocation of each district in the county which was above its floor. The number of districts raised to their floor in 1975-1976 was four.

VII. Reallocation

Moneys available for reallocation are distributed to districts which experience financial hardships. Written requests are required by the LEAs.

In FY 76, $300,000 of a total allocation of $2 million was reallocated.

VIII. Complaint Handling

No changes in allocations are made on the basis of complaints. Information is supplied on the procedures used and the regulations in order to resolve complaints.

IX. Costs

Annual Costs

Data gathering

Welfare Department - AFDC and Foster

___ professional person days @$75/day ___ clerical person days @$35/day	Not Available

State Education Agency

3 professional person days @$75/day	$225

Calculation and dissemination of grants

State Education Agency

7 professional person days @$75/day	$525

X. History

Prior to FY 75, 1970 Census counts of children were used. Information was supplied by USOE, by MCD and town. Using Census maps, the State Title I office apportioned the Census counts to school districts. Due to the perceived inaccuracy of the Census data and district reorganization, Census data were eliminated as a data source for subcounty allocation.

XI. Availability of Other Data Sources

Free Lunch counts are available from Fiscal Office in State Department of Education.